

As a professor teaching mass media and government policy at a major U.S. university I know I will be using this as an example of the dangers of media consolidation. Sinclair Broadcasting has a poor reputation and this is further validation when they force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary immediately before the election.

Fortunately we know from mass media research it is not likely to make a significant difference in terms of the vote, but this is really bad politics and all the more reason for the FCC to look at what is happening in terms of fairness.

I completely agree with the following:

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.